EXHIBIT P

```
1
     5CESVILAR
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
    SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 1
    -----x
 2
 3
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 3
 4
 5
               v.
                                          05 Cr. 621
 6
 6
    ALBERTO VILAR and GARY TANAKA,
 7
 7
                   Defendants.
 8
     -----x
 8
9
                                          December 14, 2005
10
                                          9:45 a.m.
10
    Before:
11
11
12
                        HON. KENNETH M. KARAS,
12
13
                                          District Judge
13
14
                             APPEARANCES
14
15 MICHAEL J. GARCIA
15
         United States Attorney for the
16
          Southern District of New York
16 MARC LITT,
17
         Assistant United States Attorney
17
18 SUSAN WOLFE, ESQ.
18 JEFFREY HOFFMAN, ESQ.
          Attorneys for Defendant Alberto Vilar
19
19
20 GLENN COLTON, ESQ.
20 STEVEN KOBRE, ESQ.
         Attorneys for Defendant Gary Tanaka
21
22
22
23
24
25
25
                   SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
```

193

5Cebwvilc

- 1 positions with Amerindo Panama, UK, and Cayman, that they
- 2 participated in a fraudulent scheme to the tune of \$2 million
- 3 that involved the oldest clients in which Amerindo UK, U.S. and
- 4 Panama were all involved and in which millions of dollars were
- 5 going around both to off shore entities and out of "off-shore
- 6 accounts" where the Amerindo brokerage accounts that are
- 7 affiliated with Amerindo Panama, and given everything laid out
- 8 in the warrant including these closely held companies, the
- 9 owners, founders, sole shareholders personally benefiting, the
- 10 ordinary person at least Mr. Vilar having personal contact with
- 11 victims that there's probable cause to believe that this other
- 12 off-shore entity is involved, too. That's the probable cause
- 13 argument with respect to Cayman.
- 14 THE COURT: All right. I don't want to get into
- 15 arguing the whole motion at this point. I realize I asked the
- 16 question -- it did pop into my head -- but why should the
- 17 defendants get to ask the questions that in particular
- 18 Mr. Kober and I were talking about.
- 19 MR. LITT: I don't see how they advanced the ball in
- 20 getting to the issue that has to be decided. What was told to
- 21 the 19 agents or inspectors doesn't tell you what was taken.
- 22 It doesn't tell you whether a reasonable agent would have or
- 23 inspector would have relied in good faith on a warrant signed
- 24 by a judge and as described as by Inspector Feiter as being
- 25 consistent with other ones that he had even seen, etc. I don't SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

194

5Cebwvilc

- 1 see how that advances the issue.
- THE COURT: Well, in Burke, Judge Mukasey noted that
- 3 the affiant was there and participated in the warrant and,
- 4 therefore, he was able to infer that the person with the
- 5 knowledge of the investigation and understood the contours of
- 6 the investigation was able to limit, presumably, the execution
- of the warrant, and, in that case, ensure the non-Dali work,
- 8 the documents information related to things other than Dali
- 9 were not taken.
- 10 MR. LITT: And calling Inspector Fraterrigo won't
- 11 change the evidence that already exists that Inspector
- 12 Fraterrigo was there, just as the agent was there in Burke.
- 13 There's already evidence in the record she was there. There's
- 14 no dispute the fact that she was there. That's no dispute the
- 15 fact that she was one of the people answering questions that
- 16 people had when they came up. So I don't see how calling
- 17 Inspector Fraterrigo --
- 18 THE COURT: Anything else you want to say?
- 19 MR. LITT: No.
- 20 THE COURT: I'm conscious of the hour and the fact
- 21 that we've been here all day. What I would like to do is get
- 22 your answer tomorrow as to the testimony of the case agent, and
- 23 are you serious about having 19 agents and having them testify,
- Ms. Wolfe?
- 25 MS. WOLFE: Well, I would call agents until the point SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

5Cebwvilc

1 at which your Honor is satisfied that the general search had

195

- 2 occurred.
- 3 MR. KOBRE: Only that because we're just relying on
- 4 Burke and the Court's recognition of the facts surrounding the
- 5 search, including what's in the searcher's head, which is the
- 6 affiant as it's laid out, he recognizes they had the affidavit,
- 7 we think that the information that your Honor has proffered
- 8 would allow us to ask those questions. That's what we're
- 9 seeking. So at this point we sort of diverge from Mr. Vilar in
- 10 seeking --
- 11 THE COURT: You're going to join their application?
- MR. KOBRE: Right.
- 13 THE COURT: Is there anybody else you want to call?
- 14 MR. KOBRE: Mr. Litt, but we're not going to do it.
- 15 Just kidding. No, there's no others.
- 16 THE COURT: Now, with respect to the statements, I'm
- 17 happy to proceed either by setting an argument. We're out of
- 18 time to argue this tonight. I'm not going to keep the court
- 19 reporter here. The sun's been down for about an hour or you
- 20 can submit something in writing. You know, it's up to you.
- 21 MR. HOFFMAN: I think writing would be preferable on
- 22 both sides.
- THE COURT: Mr. Litt would prefer argument.
- 24 MR. LITT: I would prefer argument, your Honor. I
- think it would be brief. I don't think there are a lot of

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.